



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and test this suggestion by the context, I quite expect they will see that there can be no *a priori* objection to this interpretation.

Now, what we want is a meaning for our expression which answers the following conditions:

1. It must be a phrase which either has the meaning of 'come in,' 'cheer up,' 'never say die,' or some such expression of encouragement, of self-confidence, or, better still, of exhortation, or which can easily be supposed to bear that construction.

2. It must be so generally known that even if a foreign phrase,—and the fact that it is in 'plain type,' though not in italics (*vid. supra*), points to this,—it may be supposed to have been generally understood as having this exhortative force required.

Dr. Furnivall (or B. N.?) has reprinted in the *Transactions of the New Shakspeare Society* for 1880-85 (on p. \*86) some extracts from *The Soldiers Accidence* by G (ervase) M (arkham), 1625, which are in the highest degree interesting, and seem to me to offer the true solution of our difficulty.

In the fifth lesson for the Cavalry we find the 'Points of War' enumerated; that is, the Sounds and Commands of the Trumpet. The second of these is *Mounte Cavallo*, or *Mount on horseback*. It seems to me that this interpretation meets every requirement: for the only semasiological condition wanted to make it plausible that an expression originally meaning 'Mount on horseback' should extend its sense into a general exhortative, such as in our text, is that it should be generally known and understood. And this condition, if we could for a moment doubt it, is fulfilled, for 'Mounte Cavallo' is one of those six 'Points of War' which, according to Markham, are "most necessary for the Souldiers knowledge"; that is, they belonged to the Rudiments of their Art. The expression must, therefore, have been a quite common one, and there can be no difficulty; consequently, in looking upon it as exhortative, that is, exclamatory.

Now that attention has been called to this phrase, I think it quite possible that other instances will turn up, where the exclamatory sense may be more or less apparent.

H. LOGEMAN.

University of Ghent.

## AMERICAN-FRENCH DIALECT COMPARISON.

*Two Acadian-French Dialects compared with "Some Specimens of a Canadian-French Dialect Spoken in Maine."*

PAPER NO. II.\* D.

### RESULTS OF THE COMPARISON.

THUS far in the present paper certain facts regarding the popular speech—particularly the phonology—in three localities very far apart from each other have been put on record. In Paper No. I, similar facts in regard to a fourth locality, Sainte Anne de Beaupré, examined by Professor Squair of Toronto University, were brought to light. That certain conclusions be drawn from the results compared is reasonably to be expected. They may not prove at all proportional to the work of investigation, like much scientific research, but the scientist would be the last to disparage such investigation on that account.

Perhaps by any one interested enough to desire to know what the dialects are that are spoken in America, the question may now very naturally be asked at once: Is the dialect examined by Professor Sheldon an Acadian French or a Canadian French dialect? This question presupposes that "Acadian French" is one thing and "Canadian French" another, and if such be the case, the question can be answered by showing to what extent certain forms in the Waterville dialect are Acadian, or Canadian, or something else.

In Paper No. I, I have shown that the same provinces of France furnished contingents for both Acadia and Canada, and that one of these regions was the neighborhood of Paris, which by reason of its political preponderance had in almost every way, as well as linguistically, exerted more influence upon the surrounding regions than any one of them could upon it or *upon each other*. Take, for instance, as a concrete example, the dialect form *z sü*=Fr. *je suis*. Because this form belongs to Champagne,<sup>117</sup> or is a common Burgundian<sup>117</sup> one, hardly signifies that its appearance in Canada

\* Paper No. I appeared in MOD. LANG. NOTES for December, 1893, January and February, 1894; and part of Paper No. II in December, 1897, January and February, 1898.

<sup>117</sup> *Étude sur le langage populaire de Paris*, Ch. Nisard, p. 227.

is to be directly traced to either of those provinces, for the form is a common one to the region of Paris,—though it may have come there from another province. Just so with a number of widely spread pronunciations. Thus again dialect *â*=Fr. *e* before *r* plus a pronounced consonant as in *vârt*=Fr. *verte*; the French dialect dictionaries show this pronunciation to be the usual one in a number of provinces, and Thurot<sup>118</sup> illustrates repeatedly its use both in the provinces and about Paris from very early times. The same is true of the sound *â* often called the "Norman *a*," and so characteristic of many French provinces and of perhaps all Acadian or Canadian French. Likewise the forms of the personal pronouns *âl* or *â*=Fr. *elle* and of *i* or *iz*=Fr. *il* or *ils* are identical in a number of regions both in France and in the Dominion of Canada. So are the sounds *wé* or *wè* representing Fr. *oi* under certain conditions. The pronunciation *-â* or *-æ*, representing the Fr. *-ais* as in dialect *avâ*=Fr. *avais*, *movâ*=Fr. *mauvais*, also so characteristic of Canadian French, mostly in endings, as in the two examples (but which as yet I have not met in Acadian regions), is common to Poitou as well as to the region about Paris.<sup>119</sup> So, too, the pronunciation *ôr*=Fr. *or* final or followed by silent consonants, as in dialect *fôr*=Fr. *fort*, *kôr*=Fr. *corps*, etc., is common to several regions<sup>120</sup> besides that of Paris.<sup>120</sup> Also *é*=Fr. *è* in words like dialect *frér*=Fr. *frère*, *mér*=Fr. *mère* and *pér*<sup>121</sup>=Fr. *père*. And *ü*=Fr. *eu*, as in *üzèn*=Fr. *Eugène*.<sup>122</sup>

One can easily show a similar condition of things to a certain extent to be true of the consonants,—going to show together with the vowel indications, that the French of the region about Paris of two hundred and fifty years ago is the basis of both Acadian and Canadian French.<sup>122 (bis)</sup> We come, then, naturally to consider the question of what distinguishes Aca-

dian from Canadian French, and here the similarities in nature and extent are such that an idea of them may perhaps best be obtained by supposing a question somewhat parallel to this to be asked: How does American English differ from the English spoken in England? There might well be quite as many different attempts to characterize the English spoken in England as that spoken in America in making such a discrimination, and hence the difficulty of obtaining sufficiently adequate results. Just so with Acadian and Canadian French. After traveling through French Canada and Acadia and observing carefully the popular speech, the same conclusion can hardly fail to present itself naturally to the observer as after having traveled through England and America,—that is, just as the language heard in the latter two countries is essentially one tongue with more or less variation according to locality, so too the language of Acadia and of Canada is one and the same with like local variations. Owing to the vastness of the region and these local variations throughout the territory, the obstacles to making a general comparison become obvious at once.

As an example of what has been done in a somewhat general way, take the interesting articles that have appeared by the Acadian or Canadian writers<sup>123</sup> themselves in regard to the French of Acadian or Canadian regions in general, in the Dominion of Canada. Undoubtedly their remarks are true for the regions they are familiar with and characterize. But if the impression were received from their observations that such characteristics as they describe were heard either throughout Acadia or Canada, as the case may be, this impression might be found in many localities to fall short realization. M. Pascal Poirier has written an article "La Langue Acadienne"<sup>124</sup> in which "l'idiome que parlent les Acadiens" is portrayed, and there are pointed out among the differences between "la prononciation acadienne et la prononciation canadienne" three

<sup>118</sup> Tome I, pp. 4-15. See also note no. 77, Paper No. 1.

<sup>119</sup> See note 56, Paper No. I, and also Nisard's *Étude*, pp. 105-6.

<sup>120</sup> See Jaubert's *Glossaire*, under, *o*; also Agnel's *Observations*, under *o*, p. 16.

<sup>121</sup> *Id.*, p. 12, and the dialect dictionaries.

<sup>122</sup> Agnel's *Observations*, p. 11.

<sup>122 (bis)</sup> See Paper No. I, p. 20, last paragraph and Thurot, tome I, pp. 521-2.

<sup>123</sup> The names of six well-known writers appear in the list of references to Paper No. I, and the most complete list of those treating the subject that I know of appeared in Part II of *Dialect Notes*, pp. 53-56, by Professor Chamberlain, of Clark University.

<sup>124</sup> *Nouvelles Soirées Acadiennes*, Vol. III, p. 63.

characteristic traits; namely, 1. dialect *u*=Fr. *o* before *m* or *n* not nasal as in *um*=Fr. *homme*;

2. "Il y a aussi une différence notable entre la prononciation acadienne et la prononciation canadienne des lettres *gu*, *qu*, *di*, *tu* suivies d'une voyelle. Parmi le peuple du Canada la prononciation de ces mots est indécise. Elle prend souvent une forme dure, *cuyau* pour *tuyau*, *le bon Yeu* pour *le bon Dieu*, *ti* pour *qui*, *un yueux* ou quelquechose d'approchant pour *un gneux*. Dans mon pays, la prononciation de ces mots s'adoucit à la manière italienne et romane: *qui* se prononce *tchi* comme le *ci* italien dans *cicerone* et le *ch* anglais *chip*. Le *gu* de *gneux* se prononce comme le *g* anglais dans *gin*.. 3. "De plus les formes *j'ons*<sup>125</sup> et le *j'avons*<sup>125</sup> se sont conservés dans plusieurs centres acadiens."

After reading this article, I visited Tracadiegetche, peopled by Acadians from Tracadie, and now called Carleton.<sup>126</sup> To be sure there is nothing in M. Poirier's article that states that those particular characteristics just mentioned are, or are not, found in any one Acadian region more than in another. But it would not, however, be unnatural, so it seemed to me, to look for them in Tracadiegetche. Yet the result of such a search was that those three particular characteristics were found to be all wanting: for in the first case the dialect and standard French agreed; in the second case the dialect equivalent for Fr. *gu* and *di* before front vowels=*y*, as in dialect *yô*=Fr. *gueux* and *yiamæ*=Fr. *diamant*; Fr. *qu*+*a* vowel was represented by *ky* as in dialect *kyèl*=Fr. *quel* and the Fr. *tu*+vowel was identical with French. The third characteristic to be found in several Acadian centres, that is, the forms in *ô* or *ôz*<sup>127</sup> with the first person singular pronoun, was not in popular use, the usage being like that in many Canadian districts where the indefinite dialect pronoun *ô*=(Fr. *on*) is continually used to correspond to the Fr. *nous* with the first person

<sup>125</sup> For xvi. century usage of such forms see Darmesteter and Hatzfeld's xvi. *Siècle en France*, Syntaxe, p. 273, § 218; for usage about Paris, Agnel's *Observations*, p. 73. Perhaps the best light in brief is thrown by Meyer-Lübke (Tome ii of French translation of the *Grammaire*, p. 109) "... alors, pour obtenir la symétrie entre la 1<sup>re</sup> pers. sing. et la 1<sup>re</sup> pers. plur., *nu* cède la place à *ze*."

<sup>126</sup> In *Scirées Canadiennes* for 1861 is an article: "Journal d'un voyage sur les côtes de la Gaspésie" which gives an idea of Carleton as well as of the other towns about the bay.

plural.<sup>127</sup> I am very much inclined to believe, to be sure, that the above dialect features such as I found and recorded them in Tracadiegetche are due largely to Canadian influence; yet this is a genuine Acadian settlement.<sup>126</sup> Moreover, by taking notes farther along the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs, particularly at Bonaventure and at Pasbébiac, I became certain that what I had observed as characteristic of the speech traits of old Tracadiegetche, or Carleton, were common features to a considerable extent in the other localities examined. Yet they all presented dialect differences, and hence the inevitable liability of inaccuracy in endeavoring to make a general statement for the speech of the region as a whole.

After taking observations about the Baie des Chaleurs, I visited the remote and somewhat isolated Acadian settlement in the northwest corner of Cape Breton, Cheticamp; and if, on the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs, some of my anticipations in regard to dialect features I believed likely to be found there, failed to be realized, in Cheticamp, on the other hand, I was impressed with the accuracy of M. Poirier's observations, each one of which appeared exact for the dialect. Such practical experience with the popular speech may serve to illustrate what I should like particularly to point out in this connection,—something, too, which M. Gaston Paris has dwelt upon in his introduction to *Les Parlers de France*, where, after showing how rarely the speech limits of one locality coincide with those of another, he adds:

"Il suit de là que tout le travail qu'on a dépensé, et ce qu'on appelle des 'Sous-dialectes' est un travail à peu près complètement perdu."<sup>128</sup>

To obtain results as accurate as possible, the region whose linguistic features are to be put on record, must be divided into a multitude of

<sup>127</sup> Cf. Meyer-Lübke's *Observations* already referred to in note 41; again in speaking of *Ze* *zitiô*: *j'allons*; *j'en soyons*, he goes on to add (bottom of page) "... et de nos jours il semble régner dans tous les parlers du Nord de la France, le picard seul excepté. Ce dernier présente *ô* ou *os*, qui doit s'expliquer par une confusion de *homo cantat* et de *nos cantamus*..." p. 109 of tome ii of *Grammaire* (French translation).

<sup>128</sup> July 1893, no. 1, p. 4 (bottom).

small sections, and the phonology and morphology of each carefully examined and noted. For this purpose it is that the *Société des Parlers de France* has been started. It is with similar methods and aims that the *American Dialect Society* is now at work, and it is in this way that the study of the French spoken in Canada must be investigated in order to ensure trustworthy results,—and in order that one may characterize as nearly as possible what such features as Professor Sheldon has brought to light in the Waterville dialect may, or may not, belong to.

Until such work has been done in the separate sections, it will be hazardous to pronounce any one feature of a particular dialect as characterizing the dialect as one thing rather than another,—say Acadian than Canadian. M. Rameau de Saint-Père, who made quite a thorough study of the regions inhabited by the Acadians and of the people themselves, by personal contact with them in traveling through their Country, has divided them with regard to locality into eight distinct groups.<sup>129</sup> As this division seems to me valuable in that it furnishes something tangible for speech investigation and further subdivision, it may not be untimely in this connection and in the interest of dialect research to recall his brief summary:

"... les Acadiens présentent encore aujourd'hui huit groupes, séparés par des intervalles de 80 à 400 kilomètres. 1°. Les paroisses de la baie Sainte-Marie, et de la baie de Tousquet. 2°. Celle de l'isthme de Shediak. 3°. Le groupe de la baie des Chaleurs et du golfe Saint-Laurent. 4°. Le détroit de Canseau et le sud du cap Breton. 5°. La paroisse isolée mais importante de Chéticamp et quelques dépendances au nord du Cap Breton. 6°. Le petit groupe de Chezcook près d'Halifax. 7°. L'île du Prince-Edouard, ci-devant île Saint-Jean. 8°. Enfin le pays de Madawaska, au nord-ouest du Nouveau-Brunswick."

According to M. Rameau de Saint-Père's statistics for 1880, the total Acadian population then numbered 108,605.

Of these districts, I have myself examined a part of no. 3 and a part of no. 5. I have also observed on the spot the language in and around Québec, as well as that of some of the rural districts a few miles away, and read

whatever I have been able to find in regard to dialect research in Canada.<sup>130</sup> My opinions, if I venture any, must, therefore, necessarily be limited by my data, and in any case can only have the worth of deductions drawn from insufficient data. Such being the conditions, therefore, what may be inferred in regard to the *Specimens* recorded by Professor Sheldon?

1° In the first place, taking up the sound noted by *h* equivalent to Fr. *z*, and which I have written *h*, Professor Sheldon says: "This aspirate is one of the most characteristic features of the dialect." My notes, as well as the data from other sources on the subject, show the sound to be common to many Canadian as well as Acadian regions. In such works as those of Agnel<sup>130</sup> and Nisard,<sup>131</sup> describing the popular speech of the region about Paris, I do not find such a sound noted. This, however, does not incline me to believe that it is entirely absent in such localities; for Thurot, under the chapter on *h*, says:<sup>131</sup> "L'aspiration permute avec le *c*, le *g*, le *ch*, le *y* et peut-être l'*f*;" then follow the examples with dates and references. The evidence, however, is not sufficient in my judgment, to establish the fact of this sound being a *characteristic* one of Île-de-France French.—As Professor Sheldon says:—"In general the forms point to ordinary French words and may be directly compared with them." He has himself, however, suggested the possibility of this particular feature belonging to the province of Saintonge rather than to the Île-de-France, and the evidence seems to warrant such a conclusion. Therefore, any one particular trait, such as this, not pointing as most of the features do to the old popular Parisian French, is especially interesting, because of the comparative rarity of features indicating any other origin than the standard old popular French of the region about Paris.

2°. Next *ts*=Fr. *t* followed by a front vowel. Here the Waterville and Cheticamp dialects agree, and here again appears to be something which does not indicate Parisian French origin; for such a pronunciation is not spoken of in works such as Thurot's, Nisard's and Agnel's, where if such a pronunciation were at all com-

<sup>130</sup> See table of references for full titles, etc.

<sup>131</sup> Tome ii, p. 418.

<sup>129</sup> *Une colonie féodale*, tome ii, p. 249.

mon it could hardly escape being put on record. Professor Sheldon himself says: "For  $t\check{s}$ =Fr.  $t$  followed by a front vowel, the Norman dialects offer many examples;" and besides this statement, as good proof of its provincial origin, the dialect student has but to turn to the words under  $Q$  in Jónain's dictionary; thus, for example, one finds: *quétqu'in*, voyez *Çheuqu'in*; *Queque* (Berri), voyez *Cheque*; *Quinze*, voyez *Çhinze*, etc. I am inclined to believe this to be an Acadian feature, for I have not heard it as yet in Canadian districts, though it is very possible it may be heard in some localities there, just as in the Waterville district.

3°.  $t\check{s}$ =Fr.  $t$  followed by a front vowel. If the French vowel (usually  $i$ ) be followed by another vowel as in Waterville  $m\check{o}t\check{s}\acute{e}$  and Cheticamp  $m\check{o}t\check{s}\acute{e}$ =Fr. *moitié* (see phrase no. 30),—then in such like endings which are frequent, the two dialects agree. This feature is not one of those characteristic of the dialect about Paris<sup>131</sup> (*bis*) and many neighboring provinces,<sup>132</sup> for such testify that Fr.  $t$  before a vowel (usually  $i$ )—another vowel is represented by  $k$  as in dialect  $\check{s}\check{a}rky\acute{e}$ =Fr. *chartier*; and such is, as is well-known, the pronunciation in many places in Canada,<sup>133</sup>—also the Carleton form for such endings. Just what provinces or localities in France may have  $t\check{s}$ =Fr.  $t$ +front vowel followed by another vowel as in Fr. *moitié*, I have not as yet been able to find out, but should like to know.<sup>134</sup>

4°.  $t\check{s}$ =Fr.  $t$  followed by a front vowel which is final as in  $pt\check{s}i$ =Fr. *petit*, or followed by a

consonant as in  $kri\check{a}t\check{s}\ddot{u}r$ =Fr. *créature*. In this case the Waterville and Cheticamp forms are not alike, for the Cheticamp and modern French forms agree in regard to the pronunciation of the last syllable in such words, while the Waterville form is nearly, if not entirely, identical with what I have noted about Quebec. This peculiarity, like the preceding, does not occur in the French about Paris. It is easy to understand so simple a sound-change arising in any popular dialect, compare the popular pronunciation of English *don't you*; for purposes of comparison it is of interest to know where among French dialects such a pronunciation, if heard, may prevail.

5°.  $d\check{z}$ =Fr.  $y$  (consonant). This interesting feature of the Waterville dialect I have not met with either in the dialects of France or in those of the Dominion of Canada that I have examined. Failing to find it noted in Île-de-France French, I can only conclude that the feature, if not developed in this country, must come from some one of the many local provincial dialects of France; and as in the case of the two preceding traits, I should much like to receive some more information about it.

6°.  $d\check{z}$ =Fr.  $g$  followed by a front vowel. The cases given by Professor Sheldon  $d\check{z}\acute{o}l$ =Fr. *gueule* in no. 34,  $\check{a}n\acute{e}d\check{z}\ddot{u}idz$ =Fr. *une aiguille* and  $d\check{z}irir$  and  $d\check{z}iri$ =Fr. *guérir* and *guéri* are all cases of a vowel *plus* consonant. In such case the Waterville and Cheticamp forms are alike as regards the  $d\check{z}$ . I am interested to know what the dialect forms for Fr. words like *bague* and *navigner* are where the  $g$  is a final sound,—for in the Cheticamp dialect the forms were as in French, that is  $b\check{a}g$  and  $n\check{a}vig\acute{e}$ ;<sup>135</sup> Cheticamp  $b\check{a}g$  is interesting as compared with the word heard in the same dialect  $b\check{a}d\check{z}\acute{e}t$ =Fr. *baguette*. This feature  $d\check{z}$ =Fr.  $g$  followed by a front vowel does not seem to me to be taken from old popular Parisian French where I do not find such a pronunciation noted. As is well-known, a pronunciation of frequent occurrence in many localities in Canada is dialect  $y$ =Fr.  $g$  followed by front vowel. This I have noted in Carleton and also around Quebec. Such a pronunciation may well have come

<sup>131</sup> (*bis*) Agnel, *Observations*, under  $t$ , p. 28.

<sup>132</sup> Talbert, *Dialecte blaisois*, p. 232.

<sup>133</sup> Legendre, *Langue française*, p. 47.

<sup>134</sup> In a work like the *Patois Lorrains* by Lucien Adam, investigating more or less the speech of all the towns of the departments of la Meurthe, la Moselle and les Vosges, of which region Nancy might be considered the capital, traces here and there of many speech traits can be found. For instance, I find both in the vocabulary on p. 345 for Fr. *moitié*: *m.tché* (Laneuvelotte); *m.tché*, (Art-sur-Meurthe), mentioned also on p. 24 under § iv. But from such data I can only infer vaguely, and I think it is to just such work as this that M. Paris alludes in the *Parlers de France* (note 128). Both in phonology and morphology the speech of this northeast region of France lacks that homogeneity which characterizes, as far as I have observed, the French of the Dominion of Canada, and for that reason makes it impracticable to draw conclusions from the territory as a whole.

<sup>135</sup> While my notes record  $d\check{a}z\acute{u}it$  for Fr. *aiguille*, right alongside also for Cheticamp I have  $\check{a}gi$ =Fr. *anguille*, which looks irregular compared with  $d\check{a}z\acute{u}i$ .

originally from the province of Saintonge, for the statement is made in Jônain: "*gu*s'adouciten *ye*" and the examples given are: anyille=Fr. *anguille*; yarre=Fr. *guerre* and yetter=Fr. *guetter*.<sup>136</sup>

7°. dz=Fr. *d* followed by *i* (or as in nos. 20 and 52 *u*). To illustrate this but two examples appear of Waterville specimens: mudži (módži)=Fr. *maudit*, where the *d* in French is followed by a final *i*, and in the expressions džü pidži=Fr. *du pays* and džübwå=Fr. *du bois*, where the Fr. *u* is followed by a consonant. This feature is parallel then with no. 4° above: tṣ=Fr. *t* followed by final *i* as in ptsi=Fr. *petit*; or=Fr. *t*+front vowel+consonant as in kriatšür=Fr. *créature* and like its parallel does not occur in the Cheticamp dialect which is identical with standard French in the pronunciation of such forms, but does occur like its parallel in and around Quebec and likewise, too, does not characterize the popular speech about Paris.<sup>137</sup>

8°. dž=Fr. *d*+front vowel (almost always *i*) +vowel. There is, I think, in the "Specimens," no example of a case of dialect dž=Fr. *d*+*i*+vowel. It seems not unnatural to suppose, however, that inasmuch as tṣ=Fr. *ti* before a vowel as shown in 3° above, so dž will represent Fr. *di* before a vowel, more especially, too, because such is the case in the Cheticamp dialect; one might, therefore, divine that the form for Fr. *dieu* in the Waterville dialect is probably džö as in Cheticamp French. While my belief is that such will be found to be the case, there is absolutely no means of knowing except by actually recording such examples. Dialect gy=Fr. *di*+a vowel is quite common in the neighborhood of Quebec and at the Falls of Montmorency, where I noted it.<sup>138</sup> Such a pronunciation is current in the popular speech about Paris.<sup>139</sup> Dialect y=Fr. *d* before *i*+vowel (yåb=Fr. *diable*), I know, too, can be heard in Canadian localities.<sup>138</sup> Corblet, in his *Glossaire du Patois Picard*, gives several other

dialect forms for Fr. *dieu*, writing the Savoy form *djeu*,<sup>140</sup> such a pronunciation of Fr. *dieu*, I have not found noted for the region of Paris.

The features of the Waterville dialect as brought out and illustrated by the examples under the three sections into which Professor Sheldon has divided them: I. *h*=Fr. *ž*; II. tṣ=Fr. *t* or *k* followed by a front vowel, and III. dž=Fr. *y* (consonant), *g* followed by a front vowel, and *d* followed by *i*, each of which I have just discussed, are, perhaps, phonetically the most interesting ones the dialect contains. All of the eight traits described differ from the great majority of the speech features found throughout Canada, in that they do not point directly back to the French about the region of Paris as their original starting place. And the primary significance of Professor Sheldon's paper is the suggestion contained therein that such may possibly be found to be actually the case with regard to some of the more striking features in the Waterville dialect.

Besides these traits just described, however, there are several other points brought out in the "Specimens" well worthy of more consideration, and which reveal features that as yet I have not met, or am but little acquainted with.

1°. èž for Fr. *je* as in examples 8, 12 and 13. This *ž* preceding the consonant *ž* has the appearance of a glide, something similar to *èl* for Fr. *le*, as in phrase no. 28. Similar, if not identical, dialect forms given by Corblet for Fr. *je* are *ej* and *euj*.<sup>141</sup> In phrases nos. 83 and 88, it may not be superfluous to remark the omission entirely of a form corresponding to French *je*, though this may possibly be merely such a colloquial feature as Passy has noted for colloquial French; as, for example, tsé pa=Fr. (*Je ne*) *sais pas*.<sup>142</sup>

2°. The form *el*, (*èl*) for the definite article, as in phrase no. 28. As this is the only example among the "Specimens" it appears to me doubtful whether it be a genuine form and used with some regularity for the French masculine definite article as in Picard "*el*" for Fr. *le*,<sup>143</sup> or merely *l*=Fr. *le* pronounced with the

<sup>140</sup> P. 371 under *diu et djiu*.

<sup>141</sup> *Glossaire*, p. 103, § 1v.

<sup>142</sup> *Étude*, p. 123, § 271.

<sup>143</sup> Corblet's *Glossaire* § 1, p. 98.

<sup>136</sup> P. 20, introduction to the *Dictionnaire Saintonguais*.

<sup>137</sup> On p. 344 of the *Patois Lorrains* appears, perhaps, an example of Fr. *di*=dialect dž in the word *maidji*=Fr. *mardi* (Laneuvelette).

<sup>138</sup> Legendre, *Langue Française au Canada*, p. 47; also note 44, Paper No. 1.

<sup>139</sup> Nisard, *Langage populaire de Paris*, p. 200.

vowel sound or glide, which will naturally precede the liquids *l* and *r*. Compare *êz*=Fr. *je* just commented on above.

3°. *ma*=Fr. *moi*, as in phrases nos. 44, 45 and 95, both in pronunciation and construction is curious.<sup>144</sup> The Canadian form about Quebec is *moɛ*, as in phrase no. 14, or oftener *moé*, while in the two Acadian dialects it is *mwa*. I have already commented on the syntax of this phrase in note no. 60.

4°. *li vü* in phrase no. 83—"I saw him and also I saw her=?" For the omission of a form corresponding to French *je* see under 1°, just above. Apparently *li*=Fr. *le* and *la*+verb (?), while in phrase no. 43: *ôli tût aprêdêné skêdžâ*="we are giving all, everything=on (lui?) tout après donner ce qu'il y a (?)," it appears to be for Fr. *lui*+verb (?). As stated in note no. 59, for Carleton the forms *y*, *gui* and *yi* represent the conjunctive Fr. *lui*, and my notes show these forms to be common to many regions. *li*=Fr. *lui*, or *le*, or *la* I have not as yet recorded. I find, however, in Corblet's dictionary<sup>145</sup> *li*=Fr. *lui*, and used also for the Fr. reflexive *se*.

5°. *vü* in phrase no. 83, in *livü*="I saw him and also I saw her=?" This verb-form by way of comparison is extremely interesting, for if identical with the Cheticamp form *vü*=Fr. *vis*, which I know to be a genuine preterite

<sup>144</sup> This *ma* appears to me a genuine dialect form preserved just as at present the same form is heard in the department of Ille-et-Vilaine (Bretagne). In the *Glossaire* of this department by Adolphe Orain are several specimens of the dialect in poetry. On p. 154, second stanza, first line of

"La Cressonnière" J'y lis comme ça: "La belle,  
J'veux pas rester garçon,"

Third stanza: "Ma, je veux rester," dit-elle  
"Vieill' fille à la maison."

Tenth stanza: J'y lis, dedans l'oreille,  
Veux-tu de ma, Marion?

Besides *ma*=Fr. *moi* in these stanzas occurs the form *ly*=Fr. *lui*, which is of interest in connection with the next expression no. 4, *li vü*.

<sup>145</sup> *Glossaire*, p. 104, and see *ly* in the stanzas in the preceding note. The following note on this expression I received from Professor Sheldon after writing the above on 4°: "As to my no. 83, *li vü*=I saw him and I saw her (both *him* and *her*, I think most likely were emphatic) my query (=?) means simply that I did not see how to give a word for word translation into literary French. I suspect, as I think I did when I wrote the paper for the *Mod. Lang. Publ.*, that the tense used is really the compound present, though I do not understand the vowel *i*, when *é* would be expected. Cf. also no. 43 *li*, where one looks for pronoun perhaps +*est* (Fr.). For this as a preterite cf. nos. 6, 17, 135."

tense, it shows that the Waterville dialect has a preterite tense. In this respect the Carleton dialect is defective, no preterite tense being found in it. In this connection it is of interest to know whether the Waterville speech possesses a real future tense other than the forms expressing that idea with the verb *âlê*=Fr. *aller*, as in nos. 8, 9, 20, 44, 45, 46 and 49.

6°. *fig*, as in nos. 133 and 134, is an exception to Fr. *y*=Waterville *dž*. Cf. phrase no. 101 and the \* note. I noted the same feature once at the Falls of Montmorency, nine miles from Quebec, where Fr. *aiguille* was pronounced *édüig* (perhaps *édzüig* or *édžüig*).<sup>146</sup> I suspect, therefore, more than one form for words like Fr. *fil* and *aiguille*; it would be of interest to find out if there is any particular locality where French *y* is represented regularly in such cases by *g*.

7°. In phrase no. 135, *lævyu*<sup>147</sup> or *lævü*, in the expression: *mu'ma lævyu dô gró râ*="mamma saw two big rats." The *læ* in *lævyu* or *lævü* looks like a dialect peculiarity. I have noted in Carleton such phrases as *ô l lève vü* for Fr. *on l'avait vu* and M. Legendre notes *on l'était* and *on l'aimait mieux*; M. Legendre adds:

"Lorsque l' s'y trouve déjà régulièrement,—soit comme lettre initiale du verbe soit comme abréviation du pronom *le* ou *la*, on la double: *on l'l'aimait*, *on l'louangeait*."

M. Charles Joret, Commenting on *non'* and *on* in Norman French, goes on to say that *l* develops precisely in the same way and under the same conditions; that is, before *l* followed by a mute *e*, which is elided: *nol l di=on le dit*,<sup>148 (bis)</sup> However, without more examples

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Clapin's *aiduille* and *aiduillee*, p. xix of the *Considérations générales* to the *Dictionnaire*.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. also note 60 on this expression.

<sup>148</sup> This *l* has been noted by Legendre, p. 53 of *La langue française*, and also by Paul de Cazes on p. 126 of his article: *La langue que nous parlons*, section 1, 1887 of the *Mémoires de la société royale du Canada*.

<sup>148 (bis)</sup> *Romania* viii (1879), p. 102; Meyer-Lübke speaking of *nö* in Normandie (*Grammaire* tome ii, p. 109) says: "Le point de départ de cette forme, étonnante à première vue, doit être *l'on*, surtout les verbes à initiale vocalique; *l-ô-n-žmë*," etc. This *l* in such expressions as *lævü*, *on l'aimait mieux*, etc., appears to me to be the *l* of Fr. *l'on* transposed by metathesis;—in *mu-ma lævü* analogy of, first, *et l'on avu* then *et on l'a vu*. Further references to Fleury and Behrens are given by Meyer-Lübke on p. 110, who treat of Norman *no=Fr. on*.



both in Waterville and in Norman French, I can at present only suspect the two traits to be parallel.

These last seven dialect features just pointed out appear to be more especially local than the dialect *h*, *t*s and *d*z previously pointed out by Professor Sheldon, and further discussed in the present paper under eight distinct heads. Indeed, as already shown, all the localities thus far examined show individual peculiarities, but both in phonology and morphology there are many common identical traits, so many, too, that are likewise common to popular spoken French, as to leave no reasonable doubt of the common origin of the dialects in the Dominion thus far examined. It seems to me now of use to make a table embracing the phonetical data that have so far been put on record for the French spoken throughout the Dominion of Canada and about the adjacent territory. Of course such a table represents no locality or dialect. It is purely a table of reference and merely indicates the *fact* that the particular sound found in the table has been put on record as belonging to some speech variety that can be heard in Canada, or the neighboring surrounding region. Undoubtedly many of these sounds are common to nearly, if not all, of the speech varieties; for example, I know of no dialect where the French back *a* is not regularly represented by dialect *â*. Anyone can easily look up a particular sound, the data on the subject not being as yet by any means too unwieldy so to do. Any new sounds that any one may be interested to note and offer will be a welcome addition and will increase proportionately the value and completeness of the table for dialect investigation.

The parenthetical "Acadian regions," "Canadian regions," added to some of the sounds, is not to be taken categorically; it merely implies that the sound *is likely* to be found in the region designated (simply because it already has been in some such region), but does not imply that it may not be found in the other regions. Of the endless variety of linguistic phenomena occurring constantly, as well as sporadically, and due in a great measure, as are the variations in popular French from standard French—which variations to a very

great extent are reproduced in these dialects—to well-known phonetical principles (assimilation, dissimilation, metathesis, etc.), or to analogy, no account can here be taken, for the tabular scheme contemplates only those features which typify and are of *regular* occurrence, and because of their regularity give the speech its dialectic or local character. The table does not embrace *quantitative* distinctions; they are purely varieties in *quality* of sound. The Fr. equivalents indicate *sounds*.

JAMES GEDDES, JR.

Boston University.

### "SCHALME OF ASSAY."

In a curious list of musical instruments occurring in the Early Scottish poem *The Howlat*, we find enumerated

"The dulset, the dulsacordis, the schalme of assay."

The two former were, almost certainly, obsolete varieties of the dulcimer; but "schalme of assay" is a puzzler. Of course "schalme," is the shawm, a well-known ancient instrument of the recorder (or clarinet) class, of a grave and majestic character. In the *Knight of the Burning Pestle* (Induction) the Citizen asks: "What stately music have you? you have shawms?" But the difficulty here lies in the epithet "of assay."

Mr. F. J. Amours, in his notes to *Scottish Alliterative Poems*, remarks:

"Of assay is an indefinite expression susceptible of various meanings: 'of good assay, of good quality,' was probably the idea the poet wished to convey. It may also mean 'the shalm of attack, of battle.'"

In a very similar list in the *Remède de Fortune* of Guillaume de Machault, occurs the line—

"Muse d' ausay, trompe, pipe."

Ausay, Aussai, was the old French name of Alsace (see Froissart), and it appears in *Piers the Plowman* (Prob. 228) as "Oseye:" "white wyn of Oseye." The *schalme of assay* is, therefore, most probably, "the Alsatian pipe."

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.